UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

JONATHAN BOOTHE.

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

Case No. C18-331RSL

ORDER DENYING APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

This matter comes before the Court on petitioner Jonathan Boothe's "Application for Issuance of a Certificate of Appealability." Dkt. # 16. On August 3, 2018, the Court denied petitioner's motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to vacate, set aside, or correct his sentence. Dkt. # 11. In that order, the Court concluded that under 28 U.S.C. § 2253, a certificate of appealability (COA) should not issue. Id. at 11. On August 20, 2018, petitioner filed a notice of appeal with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which stated: "This is intended to be a Notice that I plan to appeal the judgement entered in the above referrenced [sic] case, to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals for a Certificate of Appealability." Dkt. # 14. Petitioner then filed this request seeking a COA from this Court. Dkt. # 16.

As noted, the Court has already concluded that a COA is not warranted. <u>See</u> Dkt. # 11 at 11. The Court finds no reason to revisit that conclusion, ¹ and denies petitioner's request because

Although a COA request is probably an exception to the presumption that "filing of a notice of appeal . . . divests the district court of control over those aspects of the case involved in the appeal," Marrese v. Am. Acad. of Orthopaedic Surgeons, 470 U.S. 373, 379 (1985), the Court may lack

1	he failed to "ma[ke] a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C
2	§ 2253(b)(2). Petitioner is encouraged to submit his COA request to the Ninth Circuit as part of
3	his appeal, as the Court of Appeals is empowered to grant him a COA if it is convinced he has
4	made the requisite showing. See id. § 2253(c)(1).
5	For the foregoing reasons, petitioner's application, Dkt. # 16, is DENIED.
6	DATED this 4th day of September, 2018.
7	
8	$M \sim C / M$
9	MMS (asuik Robert S. Lasnik
10	United States District Judge
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	jurisdiction to decide this particular COA request because petitioner has also requested one from the
27	Ninth Circuit, which would make it an "aspect[] of the case involved in the appeal," id. Either way, the
28	Court concludes that a COA should not issue.

ORDER DENYING APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY - 2